REMARKS

Claims 19-35 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Support for new claims 19 and 30 can be found, for example, on pgs. 22-24, 41 and 46. Support for new claims 20-22, 26-27 and 32-34 can be found, for example, on pgs. 22-23. Support for new claims 23, 28 and 35 can be found, for example, on pg. 16, lines 10-20. Support for new claims 24, 29, and 31 can be found, for example, on pgs. 26-27. Support for new claim 25 can be found, for example, in FIG. 11 and the accompanying discussion.

I. PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Initially, the applicants would like to thank Examiners Khan and Tran for the courtesies extended to Kerry S. Culpepper (Reg. No. 45,672) during the interview on March 4, 2009. During the interview, the differences between cited references U.S. Patent Nos. 6,532,336 to Maruyama and 6,654,500 to Lyu and the above independent claim 19 were discussed in line with the below remarks. The examiners stated that the cited references did not disclose the limitations of claim 19.

II. CLAIMS 19-35 IN RELATION TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-18

The new claims will be discussed with respect to the references of the previous rejection of now canceled claims 1-18.

As discussed on pgs. 26-27, a TS packet can have a fixed data length such as, for example, 88 - 188 bytes. Accordingly, if the data required for playing back a single frame were distributed in N packets, then one of the beginning and end of that frame may not match the boundary of the first or that of the Nth packet. For example, even if the last TS packet of a first stream (TS-A), which is just before the dummy packet 72 inserted, is the Nth TS packet, a portion of succeeding picture data (such as the I-

picture data 76b in the ES shown in FIG. 7) may be included in the video data of that TS packet. That portion of the picture data is not played back and the data is incomplete. In the same way, incomplete picture data, which is not playable up to a certain midpoint, may be included in the first TS packet of the second stream, which follows the dummy packet 72 inserted, just like the B-picture data 78 in the ES shown in FIG. 7.

New claim 19 recites the novel embodiment of a data processor which resolves the above problem, as well as other concerns, by including a decoding section which does not output the data in the unit that is going to be decoded and starts to decode the next unit when a detecting section detects identification information included in a unit of streams.

Accordingly, the incomplete data at one of the beginning and end of that frame is not played.

In comparison, U.S. Patent No. 6,532,336 to Maruyama describes a structure of information recorded on an optical disc in which a dummy pack 89 is inserted into a VOBU 85. The dummy pack 89 is used for recording post-recording data such as background music or comments (see col. 15, lines 13-22). Maruyama fails to describe a decoding section which does not output the data in the VOBU having the dummy pack when the dummy pack is detected. In the contrary, as the dummy pack includes post-recording data, it can be assumed that this data included in the dummy pack is decoded and played.

U.S. Patent No. 6,654,500 to Lyu describes an MPEG video decoding system in which a demultiplexer 11 is coupled to a video buffer 12, which is coupled to a video decoder 13. When an overflow in the buffer is detected, error data is stored at a location where the overflow has occurred, and data is discarded, in accordance with the error data, until the next initial code is detected. However, Lyu fails to describe an inserting section for inserting identification information between the streams that have been acquired by a stream acquiring section, and the decoder 13 not outputting the

data in the unit that is going to be decoded and starting to decode the next unit.

Although Lyu describes the video decoder 13 not decoding video bit streams from the time an error code is detected until a normal code is received (see col. 4, lines 39-41), Lyu does not recognize the problem regarding incomplete data that may be in a unit at the point at which the error code is detected. That is, Lyu will decode a portion of a unit including incomplete data which occurs before the error code is received.

Accordingly, because Maruyama and Lyu fail to teach or suggest a data processor including an inserting section for inserting identification information between the streams that have been acquired by a stream acquiring section, and the decoder not outputting the data in the unit that is going to be decoded and starting to decode the next unit when the detecting section detects identification information included in a unit of streams, new claim 19, as well as dependent claims 20-24, should be in condition for allowance.

New claim 25 recites the novel method of *inter alia* adding identification information to the end of the first stream when a second stream, of which the data is discontinuous with the first stream, is acquired after the first stream, and starting to decode the next unit without outputting the data in the unit that is going to be decoded when the identification information has been detected.

As discussed above, Maruyama and Lyu fail to teach or suggest a data processor including an inserting section for inserting identification information between the streams that have been acquired by a stream acquiring section, and the decoder not outputting the data in the unit that is going to be decoded and starting to decode the next unit when the detecting section detects identification information included in a unit of streams. Accordingly, new claim 25, as well as dependent claims 26-29, should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 30 also recites novel embodiment associated with a data processor in which a detecting section determines whether or not the identification information is included in one of the number of units, and the decoding section does not output the

decoded data associated with the one of the number of units and starts to decode the next unit when the detecting section has detected the identification information.

As discussed above, Maruyama and Lyu fail to teach or suggest a data processor including an inserting section for inserting identification information between the streams that have been acquired by the stream acquiring section and a detecting section for determining whether or not the identification information is included in one of the number of units. Accordingly, new claim 30, as well as dependent claims 31-35, should be in condition for allowance

III.   CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 19-35 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

_____/Mark D. Saralino/_____

Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: _____March 23, 2009_____

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

okudp137amendmentnonfinal1